DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 663 HE 021 631

AUTHOR Berman, Paul; Weiler, Daniel
TITLE Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education. Volume I, Executive Summary and Conclusions. Report 88-18.
INSTITUTION Berman, Weiler Associates, Berkeley, CA.
SPONS AGENCY California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Dec 87
NOTE 30p.; For related documents, see HE 021 632-633.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-3985.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *College Faculty; College Instruction; *Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; Professional Continuing Education; Program Costs; Released Time; Sabbatical Leaves; *State Colleges; *State Universities; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation; Travel
IDENTIFIERS *California; California Community Colleges; California State University; University of California

ABSTRACT

The first volume of this three-part report summarizes the findings of a 9-month study to describe faculty development at all three segments of California public higher education: the University of California, California State University, and the California Community Colleges. Following introductory sections on the background of the study, this volume briefly summarizes the study's findings for each of the three segments. The findings cover faculty development programs, expenditures, participation by faculty, and development needs as perceived by faculty and administrators. Overall conclusions are also presented, including the following: (1) the wide variety of programs in all three segments are often hampered by limitations in scope and depth, resource limitations hindering faculty access, and poor planning; (2) there is broad consensus that significantly more effort is needed in every area of faculty development; and (3) current programs do not play a major role in improving undergraduate education. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CA Postsecondary Education Commission

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EXPLORING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT
IN
CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

Prepared for the the
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Volume I

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Paul Berman
Daniel Weiler

December 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

R-111/1

Berman, Weiler Associates
1149 Amador Avenue
Berkeley, California 94707

COMMISSION REPORT 88-18
PUBLISHED MARCH 1988

THIS is one in a series of consultants' reports on issues affecting faculty and staff development in California public education. These reports are brought to the California Postsecondary Education Commission for discussion rather than for action, and they represent the interpretation of the consultants rather than the formal position of the Commission as expressed in its adopted resolutions and reports.

A complete list of reports from the Commission's staff development project appears on the back cover under numbers 88-17 through 88-23.

Like other publications of the Commission, this report is not copyrighted. It may be reproduced in the public interest, but proper attribution to Report 88-18 of the California Postsecondary Education Commission is requested.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was made possible in large part by the efforts of a great many campus- and system-level officials at each of California's three public higher education segments, and by the cooperation of thousands of individual faculty members.

System-level officials and faculty senate representatives provided invaluable and constructive advice during the preparation of study questionnaires and surveys. System-level administrators provided the data needed by the study in order to select faculty samples, and had direct responsibility for the reproduction and dissemination of all data collection instruments, follow-up with faculty to obtain the best possible response rates, and preparation of the data for computer analysis. System-level administrators and faculty senate representatives also provided very helpful critiques of earlier drafts of this report. Their major commitment of time and energy was essential to the study's success.

Campus administrators from each segment met with the study team to provide advice on the preparation of the campus-level survey instruments, and put in many hours of work with campus records in order to provide the data requested. They also bore major responsibilties on their campuses for coordinating the dissemination and collection of the faculty questionnaires, and for helping to insure adequate response rates.

Almost five thousand individual faculty members at the three segments took time from their extremely busy schedules to respond to the study questionnaires. The information they provided forms the core of the study, and, together with the information provided by campus and segment officials, has made it possible for the first time to construct a comprehensive overview of faculty development in California public higher education.

Particular thanks are due to Dr. William Haldeman of the CPEC staff, who with the help of Ms. Mary Sandy coordinated and directed the study for the Commission. Their wisdom, flexibility, and unfailing good humor made everyone's job vastly easier.

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	i
Section	
I. Introduction	1
A. Study Background	1
B. Definition of Faculty Development	2
C. Contents of This Executive Summary	3
II. Summary of Findings	5
A. Instruction-Related Faculty Development at the University of California	5
B. Faculty Development at California State University	8
C. Faculty Development at the California Community Colleges	13
III. Conclusions	19

I. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the findings of a nine-month study to describe faculty development at all three segments of California public higher education. The study was performed for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), as required by the 1986 Budget Act (Item 6420-011-001). A follow-up policy phase of this work is being conducted independently by CPEC, in accordance with this legislative directive. Volume II of this report presents the study's main findings; Volume III is an Appendix that provides additional data and technical material.

A. Study Background

Over the next decade, California's public higher education institutions will have to respond to rapid social, demographic and economic changes -- the introduction of new technologies, a shift to an information and service-based economy, and increased student diversity. In light of these trends -- and a sense in California and throughout the nation that the quality of undergraduate education needs improvement -- the University of California (UC), the California State University (CSU), and the California Community Colleges (CCC) have been reevaluating their instructional programs. Whatever changes in instruction, curriculum, or organization these higher education segments may decide to implement, many analysts are concerned that they will not be fully effective unless faculty receive professional development support.

The segments currently provide or support a variety of faculty development programs, but prior to this study it was not known how many or what types of programs are offered, nor the extent to which faculty actually participate in these programs or in other development activities. Moreover, even general estimates of the amount of funds spent on these programs and activities were not available. The California legislature felt that this information had to be acquired if sound policy were to be made, and therefore directed that this study be conducted.

The study addressed four broad research questions:

- What types of faculty development services, support programs, and activities were available to faculty in each segment?
- What were the expenditures for faculty development activities, and what were the sources for these expenditures?
- To what extent did faculty participate in campus-supported or other development activities?
- In the view of faculty and administrators, what development needs are not being adequately addressed?

This volume summarizes the study's answers to these questions for each segment in turn, and presents broad conclusions about the overall meaning of these findings.

B. Definition of Faculty Development

Each segment conceives of faculty development in its own way. For the University of California, faculty development means activities that improve instruction and curriculum. Activities designed to enhance research skills or help faculty stay current in academic areas are not regarded as faculty development; UC expects its faculty to engage in research-related activities as part of their work.

At the California State University, faculty teaching loads are not structured to accomodate research activities. CSU defines faculty development as activities devoted both to improving instruction and curriculum and the support of research, the improvement of research skills, or the maintenance of currency in academic disciplines.

The California Community Colleges also define faculty development as embracing both instructional improvement and faculty research. At CCC, however, research typically concerns teaching, curriculum, or CCC internal institutional issues, rather than the disciplinary area research found at UC and CSU.

In light of these varying interpretations, the study used different definitions of faculty development for each segment.

- For UC, faculty development was defined as activities designed to improve instruction (including student assessment), advising, and curriculum. For UC and for the other segments, these activities are referred to throughout the study as "instruction-related" development.

- For CSU, the study defined faculty development as both instruction-related activities and activities designed to support the conduct or dissemination of research., scholarly study, and the maintenance of up-to-date knowledge (or "currency") in scholarly disciplines and fields. These activities are referred to as "research-related" development.

- For CCC, faculty development was defined to include both instruction- and research-related activities, with research defined as described above for the community colleges.

In order to clarify what is provided to faculty by faculty development programs, the study distinguished between faculty development *services* and *support*. Services are programs that provide direct assistance to faculty -- e.g., programs that provide specialists to consult with faculty about teaching methods, or publish information about research grant opportunities. Support is institutional funding for specific development purposes -- e.g., travel to conferences, or time away from teaching duties (such as released time or sabbatical leaves) in order to conduct research.

Of necessity, these definitions are somewhat artificial. In reality, faculty development is a seamless web, in which research affects instruction, teaching and work on curriculum affect research, and personal issues influence all other activities. However, the policy concerns that

led to the development of this study are focused on improving undergraduate education. Though faculty development activities designed to enhance research may also contribute to better teaching, and vice versa, this study has distinguished wherever possible between activities whose primary purpose is to enhance research from those aimed primarily at improving teaching, so that policymakers concerned with improving classroom instruction may consider policy options involving activities expressly designed for that purpose.

At the same time, any comparisons among the three segments should be treated with extreme caution. Segmental differences in missions, organization, traditions and budgeting are so great that the nature of faculty development and the ways that specific programs operate can have different meanings in one segment compared to the others. Accordingly, the study does not compare findings about faculty development across segments.

C. Contents of This Executive Summary

The next section briefly summarizes the study's findings for each segment. In keeping with the study's four research questions, the main findings for each segment cover faculty development programs, expenditures, participation by faculty, and development needs as perceived by faculty and administrations. Unless otherwise noted, the findings related to faculty development programs are generally for academic year 1985-86; findings related to expenditures are generally for FY 1985-86; and the findings on faculty participation are for the period spring 1986 - spring 1987. The data on perceived needs were collected during the spring and fall of 1987. Detailed statistics and tables can be found in the other study volumes. The last section presents the study's conclusions.

II. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. INSTRUCTION-RELATED FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA[1]

Instruction-related development activities at UC relied on faculty to initiate steps to enhance their teaching or curriculum skills. UC faculty were neither routinely expected to participate in development activities nor systematically provided with evaluations that might point to the need for improving instructional abilities. The only consistent form of such feedback was student evaluations of teaching (the norm on most campuses). However, these evaluations did not play a major role in most departments in evaluations for faculty tenure or promotion. Faculty viewed their career advancement as depending almost entirely on research productivity; neither campuses nor most departments created strong career incentives for individual faculty at UC to improve instruction or curriculum.

i. Programs and Activities

1. ***Faculty Development Services.*** All UC campuses provided some institutional services for instruction-related faculty development. These services generally concentrated on the provision of specialist assistance (e.g., to critique teaching techniques); workshops, seminars, campus publications and related means for presenting and disseminating information about teaching and curriculum; and the provision of materials or equipment (e.g., audio-visual or micro-computer equipment and service).

2. ***Instruction-Related Support.*** UC provided *little or no* support for instruction-related development through faculty leaves or released time, travel funding, summer salary increments, or collegial communication. All of these activities were supported primarily as part of the University's research function. A small number of grants were available to support faculty travel for training in new instructional techniques, assessment skills, or curriculum development, but the bulk of travel support was provided for attendance at discipline-oriented conferences. Available summer salary increments generally supported summer teaching or research activities. And faculty collegial communications were supported in order to help faculty stay current in their disciplines or exchange research information with colleagues at other institutions.

3. ***Relative Importance of Instructional Improvement.*** The relative importance attached to teaching excellence varied among UC campuses, though some academic departments on every campus placed a strong emphasis on the quality of undergraduate instruction. For the motivated faculty member who wanted to improve his or her teaching skills (and worked in a department where teaching excellence was valued and supported), some faculty development services were available on most campuses to provide direct assistance or financial support.

---

[1] In keeping with the definition of faculty development at UC, and with agreements made with CPEC and UC officials, this section describes *only* instruction-related faculty development.

However, in most instances, research took precedance, and instruction-related faculty development services and programs were peripheral.

4. ***Role of Lecturers and Graduate Student Instructors.*** Though the study did not collect quantitative data in this area, fieldwork and UC documents revealed that a significant portion of undergraduate teaching at the University was handled by non-ladder rank lecturers and graduate students. Many of these instructors were not eligible for the full range of faculty development services and support programs available to ladder rank faculty. The quality of instruction of graduate students assistants was a matter of concern to many administrators and faculty members. Some departments required training for their graduate teaching assistants, much of which was provided by senior faculty within the department.

5. ***Role of Resource Centers.*** A number of campuses had faculty development resource centers staffed by specialists who provided advice and assistance to faculty, organized workshops or other information programs, administered grant programs, and helped to inform faculty about other campus instructional support services. However, these centers had an impact on a small fraction of faculty at their campuses.

6. ***Exemplary Programs.*** Exemplary development programs operated at various UC campuses. Two resource centers reviewed by the study had carefully developed their organization of development services; in one department a "grass roots" program with minimum funding support had coordinated the efforts of faculty, students and staff to work on critical issues; and a school at one campus had appointed an Assistant Dean for Teaching and Teaching Evaluation, who had begun a course for faculty on teaching methods.

ii. Expenditures for Instruction-Related Development

1. ***System-Wide Expenditures.*** UC reported expending $7.7 million in FY 1985-86 for instruction-related development programs, or an average of $1103 per full-time teaching faculty member, excluding expenditures by schools or departments within campuses.[2] There was considerable variation among campuses, with reported expenditures per faculty member ranging from $266 to $2747.

2. ***Expenditure Objects.*** Campus expenditures for development programs were used for salaries (e.g., of resource specialists); supplies and equipment (e.g., in support of workshops or conferences, or for a computer laboratory); for fees (e.g., to outside speakers); for travel (e.g., to off-campus conferences); and for various other purposes. Salaries accounted for the largest fraction of these expenditures -- about sixty percent of the total.

---

[2] As noted previously, development expenditures reported by UC did *not* include any expenditures for research-related development or faculty research. Faculty development expenditures for faculty affirmative action were the only exception to this rule, and are not included in the total of $7.7 million reported above. Faculty affirmative action development expenditures reported for FY 1985-86 totaled $1.2 million, mostly for research-related developmnent activities.

Total UC FY 1985-86 research expenditures were approximately $766 million. Of this total, $139 million came from state general funds.

3. ***Expenditure Sources.*** Almost seventy-five percent of UC's development programs were supported by state funds (either from campus budgets or other state funding). About seventeen percent of these funds were from University-wide dollars earmarked for faculty development, largely from the UC Office of the President. (A small fraction of University-wide dollars were non-state University funds originating at the system or campus levels.) The balance of the funds came largely from federal and private sources.

4. ***Cost of Off-Campus Development Activities.*** The expenditures documented above account for funds specifically allocated by campuses or the UC system for instruction-related development programs. There were other development activities that were not campus programs, or were paid for only in part by UC funds. Perhaps the primary area of additional expenditures expenditures was faculty attendance at off-campus courses, conferences, and similar activities. Based on UC faculty reports, the cost of participating in off-campus instruction-related development was $1.1 million, most of which was in addition to the $7.7 million reported by the UC campuses and system. The average expenditure per participating faculty member for off-campus faculty development at UC was $854.[3]

5. ***Sources of Support for Off-Campus Expenditures.*** According to UC faculty, about thirty percent of expenditures for off-campus instruction-related development activities were from personal funds -- the largest single source of such funding. Department, school or campus funds -- the next biggest source of funding for off-campus expenditures -- supported about one-fourth of these costs. Federal grants or contracts and sponsoring organizations were also important contributors. These findings indicate that campus-sponsored development programs represented only a portion of all instruction-related development activities at UC, and that reported system and campus expenditures for development understate the total expenditures from all sources.

iii. Faculty Participation in Development

1. ***Faculty Involvement in Development Activities.*** About one third of UC full-time teaching faculty did not participate in any form of instruction-related faculty development. Another one-third of the faculty engaged *only* in private study activities relevant to instructional improvement, or attended conferences or seminars relevant to instruction-related development. And about one-third of the faculty participated in campus programs aimed at instructional development.

2. ***Time Devoted to Development.*** Faculty who participated in instruction-related development did so for an average of 134 hours per year. The most time was spent in private-study activities, rather than in campus-designed programs.

3. ***Participation by Rank and Gender.*** Male full professors were least likely to participate in instruction-related development, and women were more likely than men to engage in the maximum level of development. In particular, female assistant professors were most likely to

---

[3] Expenditures for off-campus development activities at UC and at the other segments were for the period March 31 1986 - April 1, 1987 -- the period covered by the faculty questionnaire.

engage in several development activities, including programs designed specifically for instructional improvement.

iv. Perceived Needs for Faculty Development[4]

1. ***Faculty Views on Instruction-Related Development.*** A slight majority of UC faculty -- about sixty percent -- felt that support for improving faculty instructional skills was adequate. About seventy percent of the faculty wanted to see more development emphasis on instructional technology, and about six out of ten wanted more emphasis on curriculum development. Asked how they would allocate new monies among a limited set of choices, UC faculty assigned the highest priority to supplies and equipment, with travel, secretarial support and reduced teaching load as secondary priorities.

B. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Most CSU faculty were anxious to pursue research interests and stay current in their academic fields, and many felt significant institutional pressure to do so. While the emphasis on research productivity varied by campus -- and varied between departments on every campus -- peer and administrator evaluations of faculty research and scholarship often counted heavily in determining faculty retention, tenure, and promotion. Peer evaluation of teaching was also common, and student evaluations of teaching were widely taken into account in faculty career step reviews. However, many faculty clearly felt that their career advancement depended more heavily on research productivity than on excellence in classroom teaching. They complained of heavy teaching loads.[5] They felt that while the conduct of research and the maintenance of currency in their fields were essential to good teaching, their high teaching loads made it difficult to pursue these activities, much less participate in development activities designed explicitly to help them improve instruction.

i. Programs and Activities

1. ***Faculty Development Services.*** While CSU was concerned with both instruction- and research-related faculty development, campus and system faculty development services usually emphasized instructional improvement. These services included specialist assistance

---

4 This section does not report the views of UC campus or system-level administrators. UC officials declined to have individual campuses respond to survey questions about faculty development needs; they explained that all University needs are discussed internally and then expressed for the institution as a whole in the President's annual budget document.

5 Full-time CSU faculty generally teach twelve weighted units per term. On quarter-system campuses this is the equivalent of nine quarter courses per year, and on semester-system campuses the equivalent of eight semester courses. Eighty percent of the full-time teaching faculty say they conduct research, but they devoted less than thirty percent of their time to research during the academic year.

(e.g., with teaching methods, or the use of micro-computers); the direct presentation of information (e.g., workshops on student assessment); and the provision of equipment and materials. Some courses were also offered (for example, in computer applications). Faculty training or retraining was generally not provided directly by the University.

2. ***Scope of Faculty Development Services.*** Most campuses administered faculty development programs through part-time faculty development coordinators, or campus administrators whose duties included faculty development. "Research and sponsored projects" offices often administered research grants funded by outside agencies, and helped faculty prepare grant proposals. Schools and departments also provided faculty development services and support. A few campuses maintained resource centers to provide faculty development services and administer programs. These resource centers were generally not staffed with full-time faculty development experts, and they seldom offered a research-based, comprehensive approach to development. Neither the campuses nor sub-campus units generally offered development programs tied to substantive assessments of faculty needs, or to evaluations of faculty performance. The programs tended to be experienced by faculty as occasional and episodic rather than as part of a systematic or comprehensive plan.

3. ***Faculty Development Support.*** CSU faculty development support programs were mostly aimed at research-related development, though instruction-related development activities were also supported. Common programs included grants to faculty; released time (usually called "assigned time" at CSU); leaves; awards; travel funding; and payment (or part payment) of education costs. New materials or equipment were sometimes acquired, usually through technical schools or departments. Campuses also supported activities intended to expose faculty to new information, often in the form of faculty exchanges, visiting scholars, or faculty internships with industry. Faculty training or retraining was sometimes supported through released time and travel funding.

4. ***Availability of Support.*** Resources for research were scarce at CSU. Almost two-thirds of faculty research time was not funded, and about half of the funding for faculty research time came from the campuses or system. Only a fraction of the research at CSU was supported by federal, foundation, or private dollars. Given this scarcity of extramural funding, and heavy faculty teaching loads, over half of the campuses allocated most of their faculty development support expenditures for research-related activities.[6] Despite this emphasis on research, CSU funding for research-related activities was spread thin. For example, travel funding was budgeted in FY 1986-87 at an average of less than $200 per faculty member annually. State funding for faculty released time was also limited; consequently, reductions in course load were most often funded by extramural sources.

5. ***Faculty Involvement in Development Planning.*** There was great variation within the CSU system in the extent of faculty involvement in planning for development. At some campuses, faculty were directly involved in the planning of some devlopment activities, such as campus-sponsored workshops. At other campuses, many faculty felt largely isolated from campus-wide decisions about faculty development programs, and were often unaware of development opportunities (this was less true at smaller campuses, and was not generally true

---

6 According to campus reports, between sixty and seventy percent of all faculty development support expenditures were probably allocated to research-related activities.

of faculty relations to their schools and departments). Faculty felt they were under too much work pressure to become much more proactive in advancing their interests at the campus level.

6. ***Exemplary Programs.*** CSU campuses had several outstanding development programs. Exemplary programs at CSU included a Teaching Center created by faculty at a small campus. The Center grew out of faculty concerns that they needed help in learning how to teach an increasingly heterogeneous student population, and was created by a faculty task force to meet these needs. A very different exemplary program was found at a large urban campus, where a Center for Faculty Development was directed by full-time professionals with significant academic status. The Center provided a systematic approach to faculty development based on empirical research that identified key faculty needs. Center programs were based on the assumption that faculty development was an ongoing necessity. They aimed at specific problems, and tried to involve faculty directly in finding solutions.

ii. Expenditures for Faculty Development

1. ***System-Wide Expenditures.*** CSU reported expending $41.5 million in FY 1985-86 for all faculty development programs, or an average of $3852 per full-time teaching faculty member. Of this total, $1337 per faculty member was for instruction-related faculty development, $2096 was for research-related development, and $419 was either for mixed purposes or could not be accurately assigned to either instruction- or research-related development spending. There was great variation among campuses, with reported expenditures per faculty member ranging from $350 to $10,000.[7]

2. ***Expenditure Objects.*** Campus faculty development expenditures were used for released time replacement salaries, supplies and equipment, fees, travel and various other purposes. Salaries accounted for the largest fraction of expenditures for faculty development -- about sixty percent of the total.

3. ***Expenditure Sources.*** Regularly appropriated state funds supported some $20.3 million of CSU's expenditures for all faculty development programs -- less than half the reported total. State funding included support of sabbatical leaves, merit awards, and faculty affirmative action faculty development programs, all administered by the Office of the Chancellor. The balance of the funds came largely from federal and private sources, and from state agency research grants.

4. ***Costs of Off-Campus Development Activities.*** According to CSU faculty reports, the cost of participating in off-campus faculty development was $7.7 million, most of which was in addition to the $41.5 million reported by the CSU campuses and system. The average expenditure per participating CSU faculty member was $1258. The average expenditure per participating faculty member for off-campus instruction-related faculty development was $617.

5. ***Sources of Support for Off-Campus Expenditures.*** Personal funds were the largest single source of support for off-campus activities. About half the funding for instruction- and

---

[7] CSU system-wide expenditures included $1.1 million for faculty affirmative action faculty development programs. There was no relationship between campus size and reported expenditures per faculty member.

research-related off-campus development activities at CSU was personal. Department, school or campus funds supported another one-fourth of these costs; all other funding sources were relatively minor.

iii. Faculty Participation in Development

1. ***Faculty Involvement in Development Activities.*** About ninety-five percent of CSU faculty engaged in some form of development activity during the year. The lowest level of participation was for activities associated with programs designed by campuses (or the system) specifically for faculty development purposes.[8] Faculty participation was highest for off-campus conference attendance, followed by private study activities and participation in on-campus conferences.

2. ***Time Devoted to Development.*** CSU faculty who participated both in campus- or system-designed programs and in other activities such as conference attendance or private study averaged the most hours devoted to faculty development. This group constituted about half of the CSU faculty. Overall, the amount of time devoted to development was about one-eighth of the faculty's work time during the year.

3. ***Participation by Rank and Gender.*** A higher percentage of assistant professors compared to full professors engaged in developing new courses, participating in on-and off-campus conferences, receiving assistance from specialists, attending on-and off-campus courses, and working with faculty mentors. Above the rank of assistant professor, there was more participation by females than males in faculty development activities. Male full professors were least likely to engage in the maximum level of faculty development.

4. ***Participation in Research-Related Development.*** The vast majority of faculty at CSU (about 80%) conducted research between August 15, 1986 and April 1, 1987. Faculty who conducted research spent less than thirty percent of their time on this activity during the academic year, and spent most of their work time during the summer on research. Faculty considered most of their participation in faculty development to be for the purpose of facilitating research or maintaining currency in their academic fields.

5. ***Sources of Support for Research-Related Activity.*** Faculty who conducted research at CSU report that about two-thirds of that work was not institutionally funded. Funding for research from the campus or system was probably about equal to funding from outside sources.

6. ***Use of Released Time.*** According to CSU faculty reports, about one-fourth of the faculty were released from at least one course in 1986-87. This time was used primarily for research, and was funded by both state and non-state sources.

---

[8] These activities included videotaping one's own teaching, attending a system-sponsored institute, faculty mentoring programs, or direct assistance from specialists. Faculty might not have occasion to participate in some of these activities more than once or twice over a period of several years.

iv. Perceived Needs for Faculty Development

1. ***Faculty Views.*** Only a minority of CSU faculty felt that support was adequate or better for any area of faculty development, with a sizeable majority saying that all areas deserve more emphasis. Fewer than one in five faculty members felt that support for research-related development was adequate; more than ninety percent said that such development should receive more emphasis. The faculty would allocate slightly over half of any available new resources to research, with the balance allocated about equally to improving teaching and developing curriculum. They would allocate forty percent of new research dollars to conducting research, and another thirty percent to maintaining currency in disciplinary areas. Remaining dollars would be equally divided to help enhance research skills and disseminate research results.

2. ***Other Faculty Priorities.*** Asked how they would allocate new resources among a limited set of choices, CSU faculty assigned the highest priorities to reducing their teaching loads and obtaining more travel funding, including support for conference attendance. Supplies and equipment and secretarial support were secondary priorities.

3. ***Concerns of Campus Administrators.*** About two-thirds of the CSU campus administrations said that support for faculty development was largely inadequate. Over three-fourths felt that considerably more effort was needed in every development area except retraining faculty to teach in new fields, where current efforts were mostly judged to be adequate. While not downplaying the importance of faculty research, administrators also emphasized the need to help faculty improve their instructional abilities, address the learning needs of CSU's diverse students, and develop curricula.

4. ***Other Campus Administration Priorities.*** Asked how they would allocate new resources among the same limited set of categories presented to the faculty, CSU campus administrators agreed with the faculty that reduced teaching loads should be the highest priority. They also wanted to see more resources devoted to faculty travel, and to clerical and secretarial support. Fieldwork also revealed that administrators in technical areas were particularly concerned that their faculty needed more support to remain current in their fields.

5. ***Concerns of System-Level Administrators.*** The CSU Office of the Chancellor agreed with faculty and campus administrators that faculty development support was inadequate. System level administrators felt that faculty needed development for increasing their understanding of student learning styles and new instructional methods, and also needed support for research, scholarship, and creative activity, including more support for sabbatical leaves. The highest system level priorities for new funding were for increasing faculty instructional expertise and supporting faculty sabbatical leaves, travel and research.

C. FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AT THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Community colleges are teaching institutions, and the faculty have heavy teaching loads. Many faculty participate in development activities because they want to maintain and improve their skills. Faculty retention, tenure, and promotion do not depend on research skill and productivity, and continued regular salary advancement is assured by contract (there are no faculty ranks at CCC) once tenure is obtained. Student, peer or administrator evaluations of faculty performance are therefore not tied to any career incentives for faculty to seek improvement of their teaching skills or the maintenance of currency in their fields. Faculty in most districts can obtain small salary increments tied to education beyond their terminal degrees. This incentive applies only to off-campus courses taken for credit at four-year institutions, or (by district agreement) to equivalent educational experience, and is ignored by many faculty.

i. Programs and Activities

1. ***Faculty Development Services.*** CCC faculty development services emphasized the direct presentation of information through workshops and lectures, and specialist assistance (much of it for help with computers, media, and grant proposal preparation). To a lesser extent, campuses also offered courses for their faculty (usually developed and taught by faculty colleagues) and arranged programs of peer assistance. A minority of colleges took advantage of a state program that enables any community college to reduce the length of its academic year by up to fifteen days if this time is used for faculty development. Activities during these days were usually centered around workshops and lectures. Some programs were also provided by state-wide organizations (e.g., the faculty senate), and supported by the districts, and some planning was done by regional networks of cooperating colleges. CCC services were mainly focused on instructional improvement and curriculum development, but many workshops, lectures, courses, and related activities were also provided to help faculty stay in touch with recent developments in their academic specialties.

2. ***Scope of Faculty Development Services.*** The community colleges varied widely in their approaches to faculty development. Some colleges placed a high priority on development and produced outstanding program; at many colleges faculty development was not an important concern. Some colleges administered faculty development programs on an *ad hoc* basis, but most assigned an administrator, or a faculty member on released time, to coordinate and administer their programs on a part-time basis. Some larger colleges and districts assigned a full-time administrator to this task. The overall level of resource and organizational support for faculty development was low at most colleges (perhaps reflecting program cutbacks in the face of resource restrictions in the '80's). Activities receiving the most emphasis were relatively inexpensive workshops organized by college faculty, rather than programs requiring expert outside consultants or extra full-time administrators (e.g., campus resource centers).

3. ***Faculty Development Support.*** The colleges supported faculty leaves (mostly sabbaticals), and provided travel funding, released time, and faculty grants. They also paid some education costs for faculty who attended off-campus courses, supported faculty exposure to new information through limited faculty exchanges, and provided some funding for collegial

communication. Most programs of support were aimed at instructional improvement and curriculum development, but faculty leaves, grants, travel funding and other programs also supported faculty research activities, particularly faculty efforts to remain current in their academic or technical fields.

4. ***Availability of Suppport.*** Fewer than ten percent of community college full-time teaching faculty obtained released time in 1986-87, and faculty and administrators reported that few eligible faculty were able to obtain sabbatical leaves. About half of the community college faculty reported engaging in research activities; three-fourths of that activity had no funding support.

5. ***Faculty Development Planning and Delivery.*** Comprehensive faculty development planning based on campus program planning and faculty needs assessments was rare, and activities were seldom linked to evaluations of faculty performance. Faculty participation in program planning at some colleges has helped to move those campuses in the direction of an integrated and comprehensive approach to faculty development, but most programs supported isolated, "one-time" activities that had substantially less cumulative impact on the improvement of instruction and curriculum. Collective bargaining agreements in some disricts required the involvement of faculty in planning development programs, or provided structured opportunities for faculty to propose their involvement. Many faculty development services (e.g., workshops, lectures, classes) were developed by members of the faculty for presentation to their colleagues. This system benefited both sides -- faculty attending a workshop and faculty presenting the relevant material.

6. ***Participation of Part-Time Faculty.*** Part-time faculty, who teach about one-third of the course load, were largely excluded from development activities. Part-time faculty who taught in vocational-technical programs, could stay up to date through their association with business and industry. But most of these faculty did not have access to programs aimed at improving their teaching skills or helping them to remain current in their fields.

7. ***Exemplary Programs.*** Several community colleges had outstanding development programs. At one community college, faculty, administators and staff held regular meetings to review campus programmatic needs, assess faculty strengths and weaknesses, and attempt to develop an integrated menu of faculty development activities that were complementary and mutually reinforcing. The college was distinguished by its self-conscious effort to integrate faculty development into the fabric of campus professional activities by considering program goals and faculty needs.

ii. Expenditures for Faculty Development

1. ***System-Wide Expenditures.*** Based on reports from sixty-two colleges, the entire CCC system is estimated to have expended $16.1 million in FY 1985-86 for all faculty development programs, or an average of $1060 for each FTE full-time teaching faculty member.[9] There was

[9] Expenditures per FTE full-time faculty are reported in order to provide a normalized basis for comparisons. If FTE part-time faculty had been included in the reporting base, expenditures per FTE faculty member would have been $725. While a few colleges have unusually large fractions of part-time faculty, and some campuses tried to

great variation in spending among the campuses: About forty percent of the community colleges spent less than $500 on development programs per FTE full-time faculty member; another third of the colleges spent between $500 and $1,000 per faculty member, and less than thirty percent spent more than $1,000.[10]

2. ***Expenditure Sources.*** Over ninety percent of all faculty development program expenditures were supported by district and college funds available through state appropriations. The balance of the funds came largely from other state programs, including programs administered by the Office of the Chancellor.[11]

3. ***Cost of Off-Campus Development Activities.*** According to CCC faculty reports, the cost of participating in off-campus faculty development was over $4 million, most of which was in addition to the estimated $16.1 million spent by the campuses and system. The average expenditure per participating CCC faculty member for all off-campus activities was $581. The average expenditure per participating faculty member for off-campus *instruction-related* faculty development was $361.

4. ***Sources of Support for Off-Campus Expenditures.*** CCC faculty reported that almost sixty percent of the funding for off-campus faculty development activities was personal. College, district, or division funds supported another one-fourth of these costs;[12] all other funding sources were relatively minor.

5. ***Faculty Salary Increments.*** Full-time faculty in many community college districts qualified for a step increase in salary if they completed additional credit coursework or equivalent training beyond the level of their earned degree. Six percent of the community college faculty reported that they had received a salary increase due to faculty development activities in 1986-87. The one-year cost to their districts is estimated to have been at least $0.6 million.[13]

iii. Faculty Participation in Development

1. ***Faculty Involvement in Development Activities.*** About nine out of ten full-time teaching faculty at CCC engaged in some form of development activity during the year. About three-fifths of CCC full-time teaching faculty engaged both in programs designed specifically for faculty development and in the more general activities of attending conferences or private study. Faculty participation was highest for off-campus conference attendance, followed by private study activities and participating in on-campus conferences.

---

include part-time faculty in development opportunities, part-time faculty participation was quite limited, as noted above.

10 There was no relationship between campus size and reported expenditures per FTE full-time faculty member.

11 State funds include community college funding allocated by the state but based on local revenues. Expenditures by the Office of the Chancellor (beyond normal campus budget allocations) totaled $1.8 million in FY 1985-86.

12 Community college campuses are largely organized by divisions rather than by schools.

13 This figure does not include current district expenditures resulting from past increases, including additional COLA expenses as the result of a higher salary base.

2. ***Time Devoted to Development.*** The amount of time devoted to development was about one-tenth of the faculty's overall work time during the year.

3. ***Participation by Gender.*** Generally speaking, there was more participation by females than males in faculty development activities. The gap between the genders was greatest for the highest level of participation -- in campus or system programs combined with conferences and private-study. More women than men were likely to engage in the maximum level of professional development.

4. ***Participation in Research-Related Development.*** Approximately half of the CCC faculty engaged in research activities between August 15, 1986 and April 1, 1987. Faculty who conducted research spent less than thirty percent of their time on such work during the academic year, and spent most of their work time during the summer on research. The main type of research conducted by CCC faculty was research on teaching or curriculum, or activities designed to help them remain current in their fields.

5. ***Sources of Support for Research-Related Activities.*** Faculty who conducted research at CCC report that about three-fourths of that work was not institutionally funded. Of the available funding, college or system support was about equal to support from private sources.

6. ***Use of Released Time.*** Based on faculty reports, less than one tenth of CCC faculty is estimated to have obtained release time, which was used primarily for instructional or curriculum development (and research aimed at improving instruction or curriculum).

iv. Perceived Needs for Faculty Development

1. ***Faculty Views.*** A majority of CCC faculty felt that support was less than adequate across all areas of development, and a sizeable majority wanted to see all areas receive more emphasis in the future. Less than one in three full-time CCC faculty members felt that support for research-related development was adequate, and eight out of ten felt this area should receive more emphasis. CCC faculty would allocate any available new funds about equally to research, teaching improvement, and curriculum development. Research had the lowest priority among these three areas.

2. ***Other Faculty Priorities.*** Asked how they would allocate new funds among a limited number of areas, CCC faculty assigned the highest priorities to acquiring more supplies and equipment and obtaining more travel support. Reduced teaching loads were also a high priority.

3. ***Concerns of Campus Administrators.*** Most CCC campu administrations said that support was inadequate across all areas of development, and the great majority of campuses felt that much more effort needed to be expended in every area. The greatest concern was with improving faculty abilities to address student learning needs. Eighty-five percent of the campuses felt that current levels of support in this area were too low, and virtually all campuses wanted this area to receive more emphasis in the future. Nine out of ten campus administrations also felt that more emphasis should be given to improving faculty instructional abilities.

4. ***Other Campus Administration Priorities.*** Asked how they would allocate new resources, CCC administrators assigned the highest priority to obtaining equipment and clerical support, followed closely by reductions in faculty teaching loads.

5. ***Concerns of System-Level Administrators.*** The CCC Office of the Chancellor felt that substantially more resources were needed for improving faculty instructional and student assessment skills, keeping faculty current in their fields, and strengthening curriculum.

III. CONCLUSIONS

The findings summarized in this volume, and presented in detail in Volumes II and III, show that a wide variety of faculty development programs was available at all three segments, including a number of exemplary programs. The scope and depth of these programs were often severely limited, however, and faculty access to funding support and program services was often restricted by resource limitations or poor program planning. There was less faculty participation in such programs than in non-programmatic activities such as independent study or conference attendance. Though state funds supported most formal faculty development programs, about seventy-five percent of all non-programmatic development activities was supported by non-state funding or paid for out of pocket by participating faculty.

Finally, the study has found that, despite important segmental differences in emphasis, there is broad concensus across all three segments -- from faculty and administrators alike -- that significantly more effort is needed in almost all areas of faculty development.

These findings suggest that, overall, current faculty development programs do not play a major role in improving undergraduate education at any of the segments.

Yet, the policy issues underlying this study primarily concern improving undergraduate instruction. How could faculty development programs have a greater impact on improving the quality of undergraduate education? Studies of faculty development indicate that the impact of development programs on instructional improvement will be determined by five conditions:

1. *Faculty development programs must be effective.*
2. *They must reach faculty who need the services.*
3. *Faculty must be motivated to participate.*
4. *Development for the purpose of improving instruction must have a high priority.*
5. *Development activities must be adequately funded.*

The following section discusses each of these conditions in turn.

1. ***Programs Must be Effective.*** This study was not an evaluation of faculty development, and did not deal directly with effectiveness issues. Fieldwork revealed, however, that many development programs aimed at instructional improvement were simply *not* effective. For example, all segments used video-taping to give instructors insight into their teaching styles. But this activity was generally not fully effective, because campus programs were usually incomplete. In order to be effective, such programs would have to provide trained personnel to evaluate the instructor's strengths and weaknesses, advise on corrective steps, provide coaching, and follow up with re-evaluation and additional direct assistance. But the staff providing these services were either not expert enough to design effective interventions, or their charters and resources were too limited to enable them to execute properly designed programs.

2. ***Development Programs Must Reach Appropriate Faculty.*** Even where effective programs existed, they usually did not reach more than a fraction of those faculty who needed them. There are two aspects to this problem. First, faculty differ greatly in the type and extent of instructional improvement they need. For example, beginning faculty in all the segments generally required assistance in arranging their time; preparing realistic curriculum and grading plans; and learning how to teach different kinds and sizes of classes. Some older faculty required re-training; counseling on burn-out or mid-career crises; or assistance in coping with student diversity. With few exceptions, campuses did not conduct needs assessments to uncover what help faculty required in order to become or remain excellent teachers.

Second, except for resource centers, faculty development activities were scattered, and were often offered episodically to deal with immediate needs, departmental agendas, or outside reform movements. Little coherent campus-wide planning occurred, priorities were not set across the range of available development activities, and resources were not concentrated to increase outreach and impact for high priority faculty needs.

In short, needs assessments and planning are needed in order to maximize the impact of limited faculty development resources.

3. ***Faculty Must be Motivated to Participate.*** Study findings show that the most frequently attended development activities were informal independent study and off-campus conferences rather than campus- or system-designed programs. Most faculty engaged in private study or conference attendance; fewer participated in programs designed specifically to improve instruction. Since faculty must initiate participation in such programs, only highly motivated faculty participated in instructional improvement efforts. In light of faculty desires to conduct research, the pressures on them to do so, and the relative absence of evaluations calling for instruction-related development, many faculty chose to spend their time on research, or on improvement activities that were not related to instruction or curriculum. Unless more powerful incentives for instructional improvement are developed, faculty participation in instruction-related development is likely to remain low.

4. ***Segments and Campuses Must Make Instruction-Related Faculty Development a High Priority.*** The study found that faculty development -- particularly instruction-related development -- was a largely peripheral activity on many campuses. However, study findings also revealed wide variation among campuses within segments on development-related expenditures per faculty member. While some program options were difficult for very small campuses to implement (e.g., not all campuses could afford to hire a full-time faculty development director), variation in expenditures per faculty member was not directly related to campus size. This variation demonstrates that different campuses can and do make very different choices about how to allocate available resources. A minority of campuses did make faculty development a high priority. In addition to allocating more funds for development, these campuses were able to make other essential contributions that did not require the direct expenditure of scarce dollars -- e.g., contributions of planning time and energy, staff reassignments to help manage development programs, and policy guidelines that encouraged and legitimated faculty development as a high priority campus objective.

In other words, some campuses could and did shift their priorities to make faculty development a major and institutionalized activity. More could do so, and do so in a way that emphasized instruction-related development programs.

Despite their relative autonomy, however, campuses actions also depend on their segment's policies. Large and difficult issues must be faced by each segment if a shift in campus priorities is to yield maximum benefits:

- UC has been reviewing its undergraduate teaching practices in response to calls for reforms in undergraduate education. UC policies call for a strong emphasis on teaching excellence in evaluations of faculty for promotion, but the study found that faculty continued to treat their career advancement prospects almost exclusively in terms of research productivity. While conducting research often helps teaching, it is widely agreed that development programs designed to improve instruction are also crucial if undergraduate education is to be improved. In order for new instruction-related development programs to have a major impact, UC will have to make progress in its efforts to create incentives and foster a climate for teaching excellence.

- At CSU, most faculty were highly motivated to conduct research. At the same time, CSU's primary mission is instruction, so most faculty had heavy teaching loads, and resources for released time were scarce. These circumstances have created what faculty described as a "double bind" -- they had inadequate time for research, and low incentives to spend scarce time in development activities aimed at improving instruction. In these circumstances, the study found that faculty opted for research-related faculty development. If CSU can clarify its internal priorities and reward systems, new faculty development programs aimed at instructional improvement would be more likely to have a sustained impact on the quality of teaching and curriculum.

- At CCC, faculty retention and tenure is not based on research productivity, and pre-tenure evaluation of teaching competence is weak at many campuses. Evaluation of tenured faculty is not tied to career advancement, so faculty "promotion" -- advancement on the salary scale -- depends almost exclusively on years of experience, and is essentially automatic. Professional motivation nothwithstanding, faculty thus had no career incentives to engage in development activities. The legislature is currently considering reforms that could change the bases for tenure and evaluation. Insofar as the evaluation system is strengthened, faculty development could be linked to evaluation, and the context for instituting faculty development at CCC could be greatly improved.

5. ***Faculty Development Must be Adequately Funded.*** While there are no objective criteria available to define "adequacy", the study findings strongly suggest that funding for instruction-related development was considerably below the levels needed to have a significant impact at all three segments. Exemplary instructional development programs, for example, either did not have adequate funds to expand their impact on or beyond their campuses, or were struggling to maintain their current levels of activities despite scarce resources.

Resource problems differed from segment to segment.
At UC, administrators consistently distinguished between the generous resources available for research, and the relative absence of resources set aside explicitly to help faculty improve curriculum and instruction.

At CSU, most faculty development expenditures were for research-related activities, leaving limited resources available for funding instruction-related development. Travel grants were restricted to an average of $200 per faculty member annually throughout the system, and most released time was funded by non-state sources. CSU administrators pointed out that where comparatively high levels of discretionary campus resources were provided to faculty development, they had generally been taken from other programs, which were "stripped" of their own funding. And they believed that faculty participation in campus- or system-designed programs would have been higher if resources had been available to offer more workshops, institutes, and similar activities.

At CCC administrators and faculty reported that resources to fund sabbaticals were wholly inadequate, and only ten percent of the faculty could obtain released time for development activities. As noted previously, the community colleges mostly emphasized relatively inexpensive workshops organized by campus faculty, rather than programs requiring expert consultants or extra full-time administrators (e.g., campus resource centers).

There is thus no single or simple remedy for the anemic condition of faculty development at California's public institutions of higher education. But there is no mystery, either. The five factors identified above could all be addressed: Models for effective programs exist; faculty needs could be assessed and appropriate planning initiated; incentives for faculty to improve instruction could be strengthened; campuses could institutionalize instructional development as an integral aspect of academic life; and more resources could be allocated for all these purposes.

Each segment has important strengths and resources that could be used to improve instruction. The exemplary programs identified by the study demonstrate the potential capabilities of each segment to mount effective development programs. Moreover, the study found talent, expertise, experience, and motivation at each segment that could be called on to improve faculty development. For example:

- The UC resource centers are a potentially powerful mechanism for coordinating, advertising, and legitimating campus faculty development activities, and a device for bringing special expertise to bear directly on faculty development issues. On every campus, some faculty reported strong departmental emphases on teaching excellence, and support for faculty who sought development assistance for improving the quality of their instruction.

- CSU has a number of faculty resource centers with a considerable fund of expertise. While they do not (with one exemplary exception) currently offer comprehensive approaches to development, they represent a resource upon which comprehensive programs could be built. Most campuses also have faculty development administrators or coordinators, and/or "sponsored projects" offices, that provide specialized assistance to faculty. The collective experience of these administrators and staff could be utilized to advantage in the formation of new or improved development programs. The methodological expertise needed to conduct careful needs assessments and planning currently exists at every CSU campus.

- The CCC practice of using its own faculty to develop many development services (workshops, lectures, classes) has the potential to involve faculty in collegial and "self-help" activities that can be more effective than relying exclusively on information provided by outside experts. At some colleges, committees of faculty and administrators planned integrated programs of activities aimed at meeting long-run campus needs. Faculty development programs on these campuses often had more impact because they were tied more closely to college curriculum planning, and to the instructional needs of the colleges' diverse students. CCC's statewide professional organizations and cooperative regional networks have also brought faculty and administrators together for development planning and/or services that were not otherwise available from individual campuses or districts; their example of seeking added impact through cooperation between or across institutions was unique to this

segment. This type of inter-institutional cooperation is a potentially effective way to expand the development services available to all faculty, particularly those at small colleges that could not by themselves afford to support expensive programs such as faculty resource centers.

In conclusion, the segments have the knowledge, experience and talent needed to expand and improve their faculty development programs. If they put those resources to work, and receive adequate support from the state, faculty development programs have the potential to revitalize the quality of instruction in California public higher education.

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

THE California Postsecondary Education Commission is a citizen board established in 1974 by the Legislature and Governor to coordinate the efforts of California's colleges and universities and to provide independent, non-partisan policy analysis and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature.

Members of the Commission

The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed for six-year terms by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly. The other six represent the major segments of postsecondary education in California.

As of January 1988, the Commissioners representing the general public are:

Mim Andelson, Los Angeles
C. Thomas Dean, Long Beach, *Chairperson*
Henry Der, San Francisco
Seymour M. Farber, M.D., San Francisco
Lowell J. Paige, El Macero
Cruz Reynoso, Los Angeles, *Vice Chairperson*
Sharon N. Skog, Palo Alto
Thomas E. Stang, Los Angeles
Stephen P. Teale, M.D., Modesto

Representatives of the segments are:

Yori Wada, San Francisco; appointed by the Regents of the University of California

William D Campbell, Carlsbad; appointed by the Trustees of the California State University

Borgny Baird, Long Beach; appointed by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

Harry Wugalter, Thousand Oaks; appointed by the Council for Private Postsecondary Educational Institutions

Kenneth L. Peters, Tarzana; appointed by the California State Board of Education

James B. Jamieson, San Luis Obispo; appointed by California's independent colleges and universities

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is charged by the Legislature and Governor to "assure the effective utilization of public postsecondary education resources, thereby eliminating waste and unnecessary duplication, and to promote diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to student and societal needs."

To this end, the Commission conducts independent reviews of matters affecting the 2,600 institutions of postsecondary education in California, including Community Colleges, four-year colleges, universities, and professional and occupational schools.

As an advisory planning and coordinating body, the Commission does not administer or govern any institutions, nor does it approve, authorize, or accredit any of them. Instead, it cooperates with other state agencies and non-governmental groups that perform these functions, while operating as an independent board with its own staff and its own specific duties of evaluation, coordination, and planning.

Operation of the Commission

The Commission holds regular meetings throughout the year at which it debates and takes action on staff studies and takes positions on proposed legislation affecting education beyond the high school in California. By law, the Commission's meetings are open to the public. Requests to address the Commission may be made by writing the Commission in advance or by submitting a request prior to the start of a meeting.

The Commission's day-to-day work is carried out by its staff in Sacramento, under the guidance of its executive director, William H. Pickens, who is appointed by the Commission.

The Commission publishes and distributes without charge some 40 to 50 reports each year on major issues confronting California postsecondary education. Recent reports are listed on the back cover.

Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Third Floor, Sacramento, CA 98514; telephone (916) 445-7933.

EXPLORING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION: VOLUME ONE

California Postsecondary Education Commission Report 88-18

ONE of a series of reports published by the Commission as part of its planning and coordinating responsibilities. Additional copies may be obtained without charge from the Publications Office, California Postsecondary Education Commission, Third Floor, 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814-3985.

Recent reports of the Commission include:

88-6 Comments on Educational Equity Plans of the Segments: A Staff Report on the Development of Plans by the State Department of Education, the California State University, and the University of California to Achieve the Educational Equity Goals of Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83 (1984) (February 1988)

88-7 Size, Growth, and Cost of Administration at the California State University: A Report Prepared by Price Waterhouse and MGT Consultants for the California Postsecondary Education Commission (February 1988)

88-8 Overview of the 1988-89 Governor's Budget for Postsecondary Education in California: Testimony by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-9 Faculty Salaries in California's Public Universities, 1988-89: The Commission's 1987 Report to the Legislature and Governor in Response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 51 (1965) (March 1988)

88-10 Eligibility of California's 1986 High School Graduates for Admission to Its Public Universities: A Report of the 1986 High School Eligibility Study (March 1988)

88-11 Eligibility for Freshman Admission to the University of California: A Statement to the Regents of the University by William H. Pickens, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission, February 18, 1988 (March 1988)

88-12 Time to Degree in California's Public Universities: Factors Contributing to the Length of Time Undergraduates Take to Earn Their Bachelor's Degree (March 1988)

88-13 Evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP): A Report to the Legislature in Response to Assembly Bill 2398 (Chapter 620, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-14 Standardized Tests Used for Higher Education Admission and Placement in California During 1987: The Third in a Series of Annual Reports Published in Accordance with Senate Bill 1758 (Chapter 1505, Statutes of 1984) (March 1988)

88-15 Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics Fall 1987: University of California, The California State University, and California's Independent Colleges and Universities (March 1988)

88-16 Legislative Update, March 1988: A Staff Report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (March 1988)

88-17 State Policy for Faculty Development in California Public Higher Education: A Report to the Governor and Legislature in Response to Supplemental Language in the 1986 Budget Act (May 1988)

88-18 to 20 Exploring Faculty Development in California Higher Education: Prepared for the California Postsecondary Education Commission by Berman, Weiler Associates:

88-18 Volume One: Executive Summary and Conclusions, by Paul Berman and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-19 Volume Two: Findings, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili and Daniel Weiler, December 1987 (March 1988)

88-20 Volume Three: Appendix, by Paul Berman, Jo-Ann Intili, and Daniel Weiler, January 1988 (March 1988)

88-21 Staff Development in California's Public Schools: Recommendations of the Policy Development Committee for the California Staff Development Policy Study, March 16, 1988 (March 1988)

88-22 and 23 Staff Development in California: Public and Personal Investments, Program Patterns, and Policy Choices, by Judith Warren Little, William H. Gerritz, David S. Stern, James W. Guthrie, Michael W. Kirst, and David D. Marsh. A Joint Publication of Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development + Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), December 1987:

88-22 Executive Summary (March 1988)

88-23 Report (March 1988)